UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Case No. 09-10371-smb

In the Matter of:

MARC S. DREIER, LLP

Debtor.

United States Bankruptcy Court

One Bowling Green

New York, New York

November 17, 2009

10:36 AM

B E F O R E:

HON. STUART M. BERNSTEIN

U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

| | 2 |
|----|--|
| 1 | |
| 2 | HEARING re Status Conference |
| 3 | |
| 4 | HEARING re Interim Fee Application for Counsel to Trustee |
| 5 | LaMonica Herbst & Maniscalco |
| 6 | |
| 7 | HEARING re Interim Fee Application for Accountant to Trustee |
| 8 | CBIZ Mahoney Cohen |
| 9 | |
| LO | HEARING re Interim Fee Application for Auctioneer to Trustee |
| 11 | David Maltz & Company |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| L4 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | Transcribed by: Liga Rar-Leib |

| | | | 4 |
|----|------|-------------------------------|---|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | U.S. | DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | |
| 3 | | U.S. Attorney's Office | |
| 4 | | Southern District of New York | |
| 5 | | 86 Chambers Street | |
| 6 | | New York, NY 10007 | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | BY: | LI YU, ESQ. | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | FOX | ROTHSCHILD LLP | |
| 11 | | Attorneys for Elisa Dreier | |
| 12 | | 100 Park Avenue | |
| 13 | | Suite 1500 | |
| 14 | | New York, NY 10017 | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | BY: | FRED STEVENS, ESQ. | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we move on to the individual status conference?

MR. LAMONICA: Good morning, Your Honor. Salvatore
LaMonica. I am the Chapter 7 trustee of Mr. Dreier's
individual bankruptcy estate.

Your Honor, when I was first appointed in this case, the initial task was to oversee the wind down of Mr. Dreier's -- what everybody calls the affiliated entities. Those are his interests in law firms that were located in California and several law firms located here in New York. One of the first things I did was to go to California and meet with the former partners of that firm, meet with the comptroller, get an understanding of what the nature of the assets of those entities were. Since that time, we have been working to collect the accounts receivables of the firm that's known as Dreier Stein Kahan Browne Woods & George. It's a long name. To date, I've been successful in collecting approximately 2.2 to 2.3 million dollars in accounts receivable which I am holding. We approximately have another 125,000 dollars in arrangements with former clients of that firm that are making monthly payments on account of their accounts receivable. I've dealt with some claims against those LLPs particularly from former associates seeking unpaid compensation. We've dealt with the trade vendors. And I expect to be completely done

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

with that wind down in the next five or six months.

2.0

The -- Your Honor has entered several 2004 orders compelling the production of documents and information from some of the partners who were uncooperative at the time. We have since been able to get the cooperation of the vast majority of them since Your Honor has entered those orders. They had their desired effect except for maybe one or two who are still being a little bit difficult. They have retained counsel and we are hoping that that will produce some fruit in the near future.

In the meantime, we entered into agreements in -with the government concerning the liquidation of the real
properties that were held by Mr. Dreier. Those stipulations
were approved by the district court in April and May. We were
able to conduct an auction sale of Mr. Dreier's two homes in
Quogue on June 17th, 2009 where we realized 6.8 million dollars
for the big house and approximately 3.8 million dollars -- I'm
sorry -- 6.6 million for the big house and 3.8 million for the
smaller house. We have since closed those transactions. I've
paid the mortgages that were duly recorded and properly
recorded. I'm still holding the net proceeds of sale from
those properties which I --

THE COURT: What are those net proceeds?

MR. LAMONICA: The net proceeds from the three properties are approximately nine million dollars right now.

Under my agreements, I'm obligated to turn that money over to the government upon the approval of the fee applications and compensation for the auctioneer, et cetera.

During that time, we managed the properties. I hired security guards to ensure that there was no damage being done at the property. We've maintained the property in terms of opening up the pool so it would be more sellable, et cetera, et cetera. Those sales out east, we thought, were very, very successful and produced a substantial benefit.

We did ultimately have an auction sale in this courthouse in Judge Lifland's chambers on July 21st where we sold Mr. Dreier's apartment on East 58th Street. We were able to receive 8.2 million dollars at that public auction sale for that apartment. Once again, that transaction closed in -- I think the last week of August we were able to close that transaction. Once again, that is part of the nine million dollars that I'm holding because we paid off the mortgage to Wachovia Bank though we should be turning that money over to the government to part of the victims' compensation fund very shortly.

I have about 110, 115,000 dollars of other assets that I was able to pick up and collect in terms of some insurance premium refunds. Mr. Pomerantz was holding some money that he turned over to me from the liquidation of those receivables. Still to come, we've identified thirteen million

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

dollars of potential Section 5 actions on behalf of my estate.

We are still working with our accountants at CBIZ Mahoney Cohen
to further fine tune that and we expect to be bringing Section
5 actions very shortly.

THE COURT: Do you have the same dispute with the government regarding --

MR. LAMONICA: No.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: -- net proceeds?

MR. LAMONICA: No. They haven't asserted it yet,

Your Honor. I'm afraid that now that I've let the cat out of

the bag -- but as of now, they have not. These are transfers

made by Mr. Dreier from an account that was solely in his name.

And we've identified those as potential recovery. We're still

trying to find out who some of the people are but, for us,

they're just names.

I have not had the opportunity to examine Mr. Dreier under the Section 341. He is still in transit to his permanent facility in Minnesota. He's in a stopover in Chicago and it's going to be difficult for me to examine him there. I'm hoping when he gets to a permanent facility, there will be a conference room there or a phone system we could use to telephonically examine him. He has been very cooperative with us before he was sentenced. I met with him on numerous occasions as did the LLP trustee. And he assisted us in selling property and identifying some of the issues. There

were some disputes over DEC violations out east and various stuff like that.

2.0

So we've also engaged in numerous discussions with Mr. Dreier's former spouse, Elisa Dreier, concerning the abandonment of a property in Westhampton that Your Honor will see on the docket. We were also discussing her claim for a domestic support obligation and hopefully come to a resolution of that issue in the very near future.

We're continuing our efforts in winding down, if you will, the various entities. Our accountants just got some reports printed from the servers that the LLP trustee has set up and some documents from the local firms. So hopefully, that will be progressing to a point where either there's money or there isn't money.

THE COURT: Once you turn over to the government the proceeds of the sales, what's left in the estate?

MR. LAMONICA: I'll have approximately 2.3 million in hand -- 2.4 million in hand plus whatever I get going forward.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone else want to be heard in connection with the status conference?

MR. HERBST: The only thing I'd add, Your Honor, for -- Gary Herbst from LaMonica Herbst -- is that the 2.4 will be net of what has accrued effectively on the administrative expenses to date which would include the estimated commissions at a reduced amount that we had agreed to with the government

at 1.5 percent as opposed to three percent, subject to Your Honor's approval, of course. So that -- just to let you know that that's effectively what would be remaining net of costs.

2.0

THE COURT: All right. Let me get into the fee applications. And as I understand it, the government has agreed at least to carve out the auctioneer's fees.

MR. HERBST: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any fees or expenses relating to the actual sale process?

MR. HERBST: What we've agreed with the government,
Your Honor, is the following. And the government agreed to -after payment of the auctioneer's commissions expenses and that
they would essentially carve out ten percent of the remaining
funds for the estate which would essentially cover the
outstanding administrative expenses to date plus the
commissions that the trustee will seek later on with respect to
the three property sales at the reduced rate. And there will
be some excess above that for all the expenses incurred to
date.

THE COURT: So the ten percent is after you pay off the auctioneer?

MR. HERBST: That's correct. And that's the agreement that we've reached with the government with respect --

25 THE COURT: So I take it there's no objection to

paying Maltz & Company, its application, which is a straight
commission, right, plus expenses?

MR. HERBST: That -- commissions and expenses. And the U.S. trustee raised some issues with respect to -- and I guess subject to the reservation of rights that all the parties have put in. But it's coming out of the proceeds of sale. But the U.S. trustee had some questions about adding -- some additional information that has been provided in the supplemental application and --

THE COURT: Is there an objection by the U.S. trustee to the Maltz fees and expenses?

MR. MORRISSEY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'll allow those.

MR. HERBST: Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

THE COURT: The question, though, is really raised in Ms. Dreier's limited objection. She either has priority or shares pari passu with the other administrative creditors.

MR. HERBST: I can address that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HERBST: Your Honor, Ms. Dreier -- and I'm sure her counsel will also speak to it. Ms. Dreier had asserted a claim and asserts a claim under her separation agreement which is about a hundred and some odd pages of about 7.1 million dollars. How --

25 THE COURT: Hold it down back there, please. Go

ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HERBST: However, Your Honor, what is clear -and we did get some information this morning, which we've looked at, is that the amount of the domestic support obligation accrued as of the filing date is 106,485 dollars -as of the filing date. Now, we have said that everything in excess of that is essentially in the 502(b)(5) and also under 507(a)(1) is unmatured and is therefore not entitled to priority. And we said that we were more than happy to sit down. But the number that we -- prepare to work with them and try to resolve rapidly on is the 106,000 dollars. And we don't have any objection to sitting down and resolving it quickly on presentment to all of the parties that will have their opportunity to look at it and determine whatever that number that's reached is acceptable. But in excess of that, it's all on the come. It's all future monies. And I believe it's pretty clear under the Code, our estimate -- our view of the law is under 507(a)(1), it specifically says fixed as of the filing date. And then under 502(b)(5) says anything under -the Court will allow a claim except what is unmatured under 523 -- I think it's (a)(5) which is domestic support obligations. So I don't believe that there is any right as priority claim -- 507(a)(1) priority claim for that. Additionally, even if there was, Your Honor, the trustee is administering these assets -- bringing these assets

in. And under 507(a)0(3), I think we'd -- there'd be an entitlement to get paid ahead of the 507(a)(1). But I don't think you have to go there.

THE COURT: All right. How have you resolved the issue for today?

MR. HERBST: Yes. But I don't think you have to go there. And we certainly have no issue -- again, we've been dealing with Ms. Dreier throughout this case. We've tried to cooperate in assisting her in a very extraordinarily difficult situation for her and her family. And we've moved rapidly, I think, on the property and assisted her in getting the meters turned over, the water changed over with regard to the property in Westhampton. I know there's a significant issue on the satisfaction but -- and we've tried to work through other issues, limited wave runners, the bicycles and some of the cars. And there's some frustration because it's taking a little bit of time, I understand, to resolve. But we've had a good dialogue in trying to resolve these and with her counsel and we have no problem sitting down. If there's other things we need to look at, we certainly have said we'll look at them. If there's other parts of this DSO claim we're unaware of, please let us know. But we estimated that it wouldn't be probably more than much of a hundred thousand dollars at this point. And we're prepared to resolve that as rapidly as possible.

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

THE COURT: Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. STEVENS: Your Honor, Fred Stevens, Fox

Rothschild, counsel to Ms. Dreier. I think that what we've

come up with -- and I think we have a fairly pragmatic solution

to getting through the things that we have to today. Ms.

Dreier has asserted a claim of roughly 7.1 million dollars.

There is a dispute and the trustee's outlined it for Your Honor

of what exactly is due, what would be entitled to an A(1)(a)

priority and also what would be allowed under 502.

The issue that we have is whether there was an acceleration of damages under the separation agreement because of the pre-petition default. If there was an acceleration, the acceleration is allowed and there's no argument for deacceleration. Then you're going to have a matured -- on the -- a claim on the petition date, a matured claim, for the full amount owed under the separation agreement. If there was not an acceleration under the contract and -- or there is some other argument, either bankruptcy or other law, that you can deaccelerate then you're going to have a fairly -- much more limited claim that's going to be entitled to the A(1)(a) priority. I think that, and what we've suggested that I think gets us through today is -- and what Ms. Dreier's willing to do and she proposes to do is let's get to the amount that we can agree on now that is subject to the A(1)(a) priority. And the amount that we're saying should not be subject to dispute,

subject to the trustee's right to go through it and, of course, other parties' rights to review it, is about 107,000 dollars. That's an amount we don't think there's any dispute over. we can agree -- come to an agreement on that and getting that paid at the same time as what we think our junior priority claim and we're -- then we have no objection to consenting to a carve-out under A(1)(a)(c) for the trustee even whether we're approved to have a 7.1 million dollar claim or a hundred thousand dollar claim or something in between in the future. But we can stay that fight off for another day. It's really just to get us through today, to get us through these three applications. We come to an agreement on the 107, we can get that paid. We have no objection to the trustee getting paid or the trustee's professionals getting paid, what they've asked for, subject, of course, to our reservation of rights, the same reservations that every party has until a final hearing. And that should get us through that problem. We think it's a practical solution. And we can worry about the fight on the other stuff for another time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. HERBST: Your Honor, we will -- as we said, we will certainly segregate 107,000 dollars. We'll make sure that we agree to the amounts I just got. I don't think there's really much of a dispute. They're probably going to be pretty close to that.

THE COURT: I don't think he's talking about segregating a hundred --

2.0

2.4

MR. HERBST: No. But it has to be presented to Your Honor. And that's all I'm saying is I have no problem. We'll come to -- you know, we're going to review the information that's provided, make sure that in the agreement it's consistent with what's allowed under the agreement, which I think it is, but, as I said, we just got this morning. So we'll go through it very rapidly and I don't think we'll have a difficulty coming to a conclusion on that.

THE COURT: Mr. Stevens, are you satisfied with him segregating 107,000 and working this out?

MR. STEVENS: What I'd like to leave here with today

is a very -- I would like --

THE COURT: A check.

MR. STEVENS: I'd love -- that's exactly right. I'd love a check today. But what I would like is I'd like everyone in the room to be very interested in getting a solution. I don't want to hold up the payments to the trustee's professionals. I want them to get it by year-end if, to the extent, the Court thinks they're entitled to it. That's not my intent. But do I want to give up my leverage to keep everyone's feet to the fire about getting this agreement, getting my client the money? No, I don't want to do that.

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

THE COURT:

212-267-6868 516-608-2400

All right. Here's what I will do.

will grant the Maltz application since that's coming out of the 1 2 government's -- the forfeitable proceeds. 3 MR. HERBST: But so is all of it. I'm sorry, Your 4 Honor. THE COURT: I -- well --5 MR. HERBST: Okay. I mean, the -- understand that 6 7 the money that's carved out where the trustee's getting paid is out of the proceeds of those sales of those houses. 8 THE COURT: The government is agreeing to pay the 9 legal fees even those -10 11 MR. HERBST: Well --THE COURT: Let me finish. 12 13 MR. HERBST: Sorry. THE COURT: -- even those that were not generated in 14 the course of the sale? 15 MR. HERBST: Well, Your Honor, what I'm saying is 16

MR. HERBST: Well, Your Honor, what I'm saying is that we carved out the money from there that would cover the administrative costs.

THE COURT: So let me ask the government since the government is here --

MR. HERBST: Yeah.

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: -- whether there's any objection to paying the legal fees sought today out of the, essentially, the proceeds of the sale and then the net amount is turned over to the government.

18 MR. YU: No, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Fine. That solves it. 3 MR. HERBST: Okay. THE COURT: I will allow the legal fees then since 4 they're not coming out of property which would otherwise be 5 distributable to the creditors in this case pursuant to the 6 various stipulations. 7 Now, with respect to your issue --8 (Pause) 9 THE COURT: I mean, I guess what we can do is if you 10 11 don't work it out, you can just make a demand for the payment of an administrative claim and I'll deal with it that way. 12 MR. STEVENS: Your Honor --13 THE COURT: That's your leverage, I guess. 14 MR. STEVENS: Right. But I would represent to the 15 16 Court we're going to sit down and resolve this. 17 THE COURT: Right. Right. MR. STEVENS: This is not -- shouldn't be a need for 18 19 that. THE COURT: In the event that it's not. If it's 2.0 21 resolved, fine, but that's your ultimate leverage. Just demand the payment of an administrative claim and we'll have a 22 23 hearing. MR. STEVENS: Understood, Your Honor. 24 Thanks. You can submit an order.

212-267-6868 516-608-2400

Okay.

THE COURT:

MR. HERBST: Thank you, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: We'll give you another date, though, for 2 3 the status conference. January 20? MR. LAMONICA: Your Honor, just so that there's no 4 confusion, Your Honor indicated that Your Honor was going to 5 allow the attorneys' fees. There's also an accounting firm 6 7 applica --THE COURT: I meant the -- is that also -- government 8 also agree to carve that out? 9 MR. HERBST: Yes. It's all part of the amount of 10 11 funds, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. As long as it's coming out of 12 what you would otherwise turn over to the government, certainly 13 the creditors are not adversely affected by that and it 14 probably helps. 15 16 MR. STEVENS: And, Your Honor, whatever your finding in the allowance order -- that they're being paid expressly 17 from the government's funds and not from estate funds? 18 19 THE COURT: Well, it should provide for the payment 2.0 and, I guess, then a turnover of the balance to --21 MR. HERBST: That's what we're going to do, Your Honor. I'll represent on the record that's how it will be 22 23 done. THE COURT: All right. Why don't you just show it to 24

Mr. Stevens and represent that he consents to the order? If he

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

```
20
      doesn't then you can settle it on him and you can file an
 1
      objection.
 3
                MR. HERBST: Okay. I'll give him a copy right now.
      Your Honor, one clarification? You set another status
 4
      conference for --
 5
                THE COURT: January 20.
 6
                MR. HERBST: That's for both cases?
 7
                THE COURT: Yes.
 8
                MR. HERBST: Thank you, Your Honor.
 9
                THE COURT: Might as well hold these cases together.
10
11
                MR. MORRISSEY: Your Honor, Richard Morrissey for the
12
      U.S. trustee. A very minor point regarding the fee
      applications for the attorneys and the accountants. The
13
      LaMonica Herbst firm has agreed to a small reduction based on
14
15
      expenses.
                THE COURT:
16
                            Okay.
                MR. MORRISSEY: We had filed an objection --
17
                THE COURT: Whatever they've agreed to.
18
19
                MR. HERBST: Very clearly, Your Honor, we agreed with
2.0
      U.S. trustee. We took out the meal charge except for sixty
21
      dollars.
                THE COURT:
22
                            They got you.
23
                MR. HERBST: And there was an error on the other
      thing.
24
25
                THE COURT:
                            450,000. They got you on the sixty
```

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

dollar meal charge. MR. HERBST: And, Your Honor, I took care of that and we reduced by 2500 dollars any questions they had on vague entries. THE COURT: Very wise choice. Okay. Thank you. MR. HERBST: Thank you, Your Honor. (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:56 a.m.)

| | | | 1 |
|----|--|------|------|
| | | | 22 |
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | INDEX | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | RULINGS | | |
| 5 | DESCRIPTION | PAGE | LINE |
| 6 | Maltz interim fee applications granted | 17 | 1 |
| 7 | Trustee's interim fee application granted | 18 | 4 |
| 8 | with respect to legal fees | | |
| 9 | Elisa Dreier's claim allowed re \$107,000 | 18 | 25 |
| 10 | CBIZ Mahoney Cohen's interim fee application | 19 | 12 |
| 11 | granted | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |